

In re Appln. of Eberle et al.
Application No. 10/661,269

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the Office Action dated June 2, 2004, and believe the double-patenting rejection (the sole ground for rejecting the single pending claims) is obviated by applicants' newly presented claim set that is directed to the aspect of the disclosure concerning the depth of cut made in the transducer sheet and underlying flexible substrate during manufacture and the resulting transducer assembly. As explained in the description of the dicing step 56 at pages 23 and 24, cutting at least partially through the flexible substrate potentially improves the isolation of adjacent transducer elements.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Reg. No. 35,562
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: November 30, 2004

m:\...224396ROA